	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Interview Summary	09/126,816	VON EICHEL-STREIBER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gary B. Nickol Ph.D.	1642	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *Gary B. Nickol Ph.D.*.   (3)_____.

(2) *Thomas A. Cawley, JR., Ph.D.*.   (4)_____.

Date of Interview: *14 November 2003*.

Type: a)☒ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant   2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: *Green et al (Gene, Vol. 161, 1995)*.

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☐ was reached.   g)☐ was not reached.   h)☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *The Examiner informed Applicant's representative that SEQ ID NO:6 did not appear to be the same sequence as disclosed in the Green et al. reference.* .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required